

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 230000000948

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP 230000001297/230000000402 for Child Caring Institution – Therapeutic Short-Term Treatment Program and has recommended an award to Vista Maria in the amount of \$24,106,425, pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the State’s rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Mary Ostrowski, Solicitation Manager
 ostrowskim@michigan.gov
 (517) 249-0438

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of Contractors to provide residential programming for youth in foster care and juvenile justice system who have experienced complex trauma and have needs requiring a residential level of care for treatment. The term of this contract is 3 years, with up to 5, 1-Year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on November 29, 2022, for 8 weeks and 3 days with a published due date of January 27, 2023. The RFP was re-opened to modify RFP language and solicit more proposals on February 22, 2023. The posting was for 2 weeks with a published due date of March 8, 2023. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due dates:

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Great Lakes Recovery Centers, Inc.	97 S. Fourth Street, Suite C Ishpeming, MI 49849	No	No
Holy Cross Services, Inc.	1030 N. River Rd. Saginaw, MI 48609	No	No
Life Skills Group	25900 Greenfield Rd. Ste 100 Oak Park, MI 48237	No	No
Vista Maria	20651 West Warren Ave.	No	No

	Dearborn Heights, MI 48127		
--	----------------------------	--	--

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

**GDBE: Geographically Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

This RFP consisted of 2 combined Statements of Work (SOWs):

- Abuse and Neglect Foster Care Program Child Caring Institution Services
- Juvenile Justice Program Child Caring Institution Services

Bidders were able to submit their proposal 1 of 3 ways (“Types”)

The resulting award from this RFP may be a single or multi-award. Bidders submitting a Type 3 Proposal must submit their proposal with the understanding that should they be recommended for award, it may be: only on Type 1, only Type 2, or combined (Type 3).

Proposal Types	
Type 1	Abuse and Neglect Foster Care Program Child Institution Services Only
Type 2	Juvenile Justice Program Child Institution Services Only
Type 3	Abuse and Neglect Foster Care Program Child Institution Services AND Juvenile Justice Program Child Institution Services

Proposal Instructions: Mandatory Minimum Requirements

6. (TYPE 1, 2 & 3) MANDATORY MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS To avoid disqualification, the bidder must provide documentation to support the following:

6.1 (TYPE 1, 2 & 3) The Contractor must not have had any CCI licenses revoked within the last three years from the date of the request for proposal. Refer to Schedule A, Section 1.1.1.2.

Only proposals meeting the mandatory minimum requirements will be considered for evaluation.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

7. EVALUATION PROCESS. If all mandatory minimum requirements are met, the State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors, for all Bidder proposal types (TYPE 1, 2 & 3):

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, EXCLUDING Sections 4. Staffing, 5. Project Management, 8. Invoice and Payment, and 9 Service Level Agreements	40
2.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4. Staffing	20
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 5. Project Management, Section 8. Invoice and Payment, and Section 9. Service-Level Agreements	20
4.	Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 2.13, Section 5 Prior Experience	20
	Total	100

(TYPE 1, 2 & 3) Proposals receiving 80 or more technical evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and considered for award

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Rachel Willis, Out of Home Services Bureau Director MDHHS	Sarah Goad, Older Youth and Education Program Manager MDHHS
Kelly Sesti, CSA Admin Bureau Director, MDHHS	Amy Bailey, Child Safety and Program Compliance Director MDHHS
Lynette Wright, Wayne County Children’s Services Director, MDHHS	Danielle Martin, BSC 3 Director, MDHHS
Maureen Clore, Emmet, Charlevoix, Antrim County Director, MDHHS	Soleil Campbell, JJ Program Manager, MDHHS
Mary Ostrowski, Category Specialist DTMB Central Procurement	Sasha Wildfong, Fiscal & HR Manager, MDHHS
	Michael Pauley DTMB - MCS
	Mike Bartkowiak DTMB - MCS
	Judy Odett IT Representative

Voting	Advisory
	DTMB Agency Services
	Amanda Herren MDHHS Procurement
	Matt Deaton MDHHS - CSA Residential Transformation Specialist
	Jean Ingersoll MDHHS - Deputy Director of Critical Support

III. Evaluation Results

Mandatory Minimum Requirement Results

- A. **Great Lakes Recovery Centers, Inc.**
 The Evaluation Team determined that Great Lakes Recovery Centers, Inc. met the mandatory minimum requirement and will be considered for evaluation.
- B. **Holy Cross Services, Inc.**
 The Evaluation Team determined that Holy Cross Services, Inc. met the mandatory minimum requirement and will be considered for evaluation.
- C. **Life Skills Group**
 The Evaluation Team determined that Express Scripts met the mandatory minimum requirement and will be considered for evaluation.
- D. **Vista Maria**
 The Evaluation Team determined that MedImpact met the mandatory minimum requirement and will be considered for evaluation.

Technical Evaluation

- A. **Great Lakes Recovery Centers, Inc. (TYPE 1 Proposal)**
 The Evaluation Team determined that Great Lakes Recovery Centers, Inc., based on a total score of 77 did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.
 - 1. **Schedule A, Statement of Work, EXCLUDING Sections 4. Staffing, 5. Project Management, 8. Invoice and Payment, and 9 Service Level Agreements**
Score: 22 / 40
 - Section 1.1.2.1: Bidder did not agree to the requirement; Bidder indicated they would work to achieve the 90 day requirement, only for internal footage, and that external is at 25 days and they will work towards 30-45.
 - Section 1.2.3: Bidder did not agree to the requirement; Bidder indicated they do not have the resources.
 - Section 1.2.4: Bidder struck out 3 of the 5 youth need types and did not indicate they will ensure access to specialized services when a need type is identified.

- Section 1.5.1: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and didn't explain the exception.
- Section 1.5.1.2 (this is 1.5.1.1 in first RFP) and Section 1.4.4 - Bidder did not agree to the requirement and struck out the first line of the requirement "The Contractor must accept all youth referred by the RPU that match the behaviors and characteristics of youth as outlined in this Contract." Bidder agreed to Section 1.4.4 but did not agree here, and Bidder agreed to the associated SLA, so it the Bidder's position was unclear. No points deducted.
- Section 1.6.2: Bidder did not provide sufficient detail on how they will address individualized needs of youth to minimize the length of stay with only indicating utilizing an Assessment Center type program.
- Section 1.9: Bidder did not agree to the requirement; Bidder limited the scope of the geographical area to northern Michigan.
- Section 1.10: Bidder did not agree to the requirement; Bidder struck out language related to what they describe as severe aggressive behavior and 1 to 1 staffing structure. Bidder response was unclear in that the striking out of the 1 to 1 in this Section, conflicts with the agreement Bidder provided in the following Sections:
 - Section 4.1.4.1 regarding staffing ratios
 - Section 1.1.3.5 regarding licensing rules
 - Section 4.3.3.1 regarding 1 to 1 staffing for effective behavior management and crisis intervention
 No points deducted.
- Section 1.10.1.4: Bidder did not agree to the requirement, struck out "and families".
- Section 1.10.2.3 : Bidder described their assessments but did not describe how they are incorporated into treatment planning and service delivery.
- Section 1.10.2.4: Bidder did not sufficiently describe their evidence based practices they are using; instead, Bidder only stated Building Bridges Initiative.
- Section 1.10.3.1: Bidder did not agree to the requirement; the detail provided explained that program length would inhibit individualized activity.
- Section 1.10.5.8.1: Bidder did not agree to the requirement as stated.
- Section 1.10.12: Bidder did not agree to the requirement; Bidder struck out "*comprehensive and coordinated set of activities*" indicating lack of time for this.
- Section 1.10.12.1: Bidder did not agree to the requirement; Bidder limited the scope of independent living skill development to household chores, indicating they would not have time to work on other skills to develop independence for youth in their program.
- Section 1.10.12.2: Bidder did not agree to the requirement; Bidder struck out second sentence due to not servicing youth with developmental disabilities.
- Section 1.10.14.2.2: Bidder checked the agree box , however, struck out the second sentence "*Provide a method to ensure the opportunity for weekly family time in person.*"
- Section 1.10.14.2.2 2nd Bidder Box: Bidder detail does not ensure weekly family time in person.
- Section 1.10.14.2.4: Bidder did not agree to the requirement; Bidder indicated that their program may not be able to provide staff to transport youth in all cases. Also, transportation would be limited to a 90 mile radius.
- Section 1.10.14.2.6: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and struck out "weekly".
- Section 1.10.16.2: Bidder did not provide sufficient detail in describing any necessary supports.

- Section 1.10.16.5: Bidder did not agree to 30 calendar day timeframe; instead, Bidder indicated between 14 and 30 days before discharge.
- Section 1.10.16.9: Bidder did not agree to requirement, and Bidders plan for how they will acknowledge individualized needs was not addressed.
- Section 1.10.16.10: Bidder response was unclear in that the Bidder did not agree to the requirement, but detail seemed to indicate agreement/compliance. No points deducted.
- Section 1.10.16.12: Bidder did not agree to maintain enrollment in the youths school of origin whenever possible. Instead; All youth are enrolled in Great Lakes Recovery Center's on-site school.
- Section 1.10.20.2.2: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and indicated that they would not guarantee compliance with language listed in #3 of this requirement. Bidder stated: "Great Lakes Recovery Centers has a consulting psychiatrist through Pine Rest Christian Mental Health Services. The consulting psychiatrist works with the nurse practitioner who provides the services in our Child and Psychiatric clinic at Great Lakes Recovery Centers."
- Section 1.10.20.2.2.1: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and stated: "The seven-day consultation will be provided by a Nurse Practitioner as described in 1.10.20.2.2.2 with consultation under an agreement with Great Lakes Recovery Center's psychiatrist subcontracted through Pine Rest Christian Mental Health Services. This was interpreted as the Bidder not agreeing to the requirement due to the fact that they will utilize a subcontractor and didn't appear that they will hold them accountable.
- Section 1.10.22.2: Bidder did not address family or supportive adults in their plan for how they will meet the requirement.
- Section 1.10.24: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and stated "maintain transition in person services until provider appointment" which indicates that they are only agreeing to a portion of the requirement and will do telehealth.
- Section 1.10.27.1: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and indicated: "As an assessment program, Great Lakes Recovery Centers will not be able to provide 6 months of aftercare services for youth with the exception of maintaining therapeutic services for a youth until they can be seen by a community mental health provider if they are not eligible for CMH services. (as outlined in 1.10.24.1)" Six month of aftercare services is a requirement of Title IV-E and must be provided.
- Section 1.10.27.2: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated the same explanation as 1.10.27.1.
- Section 1.10.27.3: Bidder's detail indicated that they did not agree to this requirement and Bidder detail of plan stated the same explanation as 1.10.27.1 .
- Section 1.10.27.4: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and stated "Great Lakes Recovery Centers will collaborate with the state caseworker to provide permanency planning for the youth. However, the program will not be providing aftercare services for the assessment program with the exception of continuing tele-health therapy services for those not eligible for CMH until they are able to meet with a community provider."
- Section 1.10.27.6.1: Bidder did not agree to this requirement; they will not provide level 1 aftercare as indicated in 1.10.27.1.
- Section 1.10.27.6.3: Bidder did not agree to this requirement, they will not provide level 2 aftercare as indicated in 1.10.27.1.
- Section 1.10.27.7.1: Bidder did not agree to this requirement; they will not provide reports since they will not provide aftercare as indicated in 1.10.27.1.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4. Staffing

Score: 16 / 20

- Section 4.1.3.1 1st Bidder box: Bidder's response did not explain hiring and retention practices for youth that matches the demographic of the youth being served.
- Section 4.1.3.1 2nd Bidder box: Bidder did not provide a sufficient training plan and only indicated that culture and diversity will be discussed as needed. The Bidder did not outline frequency and the response lacked sufficient explanation of the training plan.
- Section 4.1.3.2: Bidder did not agree to requirement and left the first response box blank.
- Section 4.1.4.1: 2nd Bidder box: Bidder did not address Trauma-informed supervision is in their response; instead, Bidder only provided logistics of how they will meet the staffing requirements.
- Section 4.1.4.1: 4th Bidder box: Bidder's waking hours ratio for youth is 1 to 4 for a 2 youth program.
- Section 4.1.4.1: 5th Bidder box: Bidder's sleeping ratio for youth is 1:16 for a 2 youth program.
- Section 4.1.5: Bidder did not agree to requirement however information provided appears to be in agreement. No points deducted.
- Section 4.3.10: Bidder did not agree to the requirement. Bidder's plan indicated it would be fulfilled by their current program case manager who does not have a bachelor's degree.
- Section 4.6.8.2: Bidder did not check the box that they agree and left it blank. Bidder's detail indicated that they do not have an educational specialist, instead they have onsite schoolteachers from MARESA.
- Section 4.7 Org chart: Subcontractors were not clearly identified on org chart.
- Section 4.10.1: Bidder did not agree to the requirement, and indicated that they are not a state facility. Bidder did not complete any of the 5 response boxes in this Section.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 5. Project Management, Section 8. Invoice and Payment, and Section 9. Service-Level Agreements

Score: 19 / 20

- Section 5.1: Bidder did not agree to the requirement; instead, Bidder stated: "Great Lakes Recovery Centers agrees to carry out all services in this contract that have not been redlined. Great Lakes Recovery Centers agrees to work with the state program manager on implementation of the assessment center."
- Section 5.2: Bidder did not agree to the requirement; instead stated "Great Lakes Recovery Centers will inform the State Program Manager for any changes in our systems or procedures that impact MDHHS services under this contract prior to the change being implemented."
- Section 5.5:
 - #1: Bidder's timeline for training did not appear to align with the Bidder's start date of June/July.
 - #2 – Bidder indicated admission plan is not an issue however their detail indicates that they are mixing populations served/sharing programming.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 2.13, Section 5 Prior Experience

Score: 20 / 20

-JEC determined that the Bidder met requirements in this Section without exception.

B. Holy Cross Services, Inc. (TYPE 1 Proposal)

The Evaluation Team determined that Holy Cross Services, Inc, based on a total score of 82 met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, EXCLUDING Sections 4. Staffing, 5. Project Management, 8. Invoice and Payment, and 9 Service Level Agreements
Score: 32 / 40**

- Section 1.1.1.1: Bidder did not sufficiently explain license date, and estimated services begin date, in initial response.
- Section 1.2.1: In initial response:
Bidder's detail did not sufficiently explain the how in their commitment, did not address race in explaining their commitment to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and cultural responsiveness, and did not share the current Diversity, Equity, Inclusion plan.
- Section 1.2.2- 2nd Bidder box: In initial response, Bidder did not sufficiently address race in their description of how their program is inclusive to all marginalized populations.
- Section 1.2.4: In initial response:
Bidder did not agree to the requirement and redlined items 4 and 5.
Bidder's detail did not indicate if they would be willing to serve the population outlined.
- Section 1.4.4: In initial response: Bidder did not agree to this requirement in that regardless of the outcome of the objection case staffing, Bidder must retain the ability to refuse admission for a youth whose admission Bidder believes will cause harm.
- Section 1.5.1: In initial response:
 - Bidder did not agree to this requirement. Bidder indicated they must retain the right to refuse acceptance of a referred youth whose admission Bidder believes will cause harm in the current milieu. Bidder did not agree that its safety-driven objection may be overturned by the Department.
 - Bidder 's plan lacked sufficient detail in their plan for on-going admissions.
- Section 1.5.1.2: (this is Section 1.5.1.1 in first RFP). In initial response, Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated that they must retain the right to refuse acceptance of a referred youth whose admission Bidder believes will cause harm.
- Section 1.6.2: In initial response, Bidder's response indicated that Department and youth's family would not be included in the Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT).
- Section 1.10.5.8.1: In initial response, Bidder did not agree to this requirement and stated that they must retain the right to refuse acceptance of a referred youth whose admission they believe will cause harm. Additionally, the proposed program will not accept referrals for children with developmental disabilities or medical conditions that render the program's primary therapeutic modalities (TBRI and TF-CBT) ineffective, that place a child at increased risk for victimization by another youth, or that require added structural and staffing requirements to meet medical or mobility needs.
- Section 1.10.12.2: In initial response:

Bidder did not agree to the requirement as stated. Bidder did not explain their exception within the exception box. Bidder response box detail indicated that the proposed program will not accept referrals for children with developmental disabilities or medical conditions that render the program's primary therapeutic modalities (TBRI and TF-CBT) ineffective, that place a child at increased risk for victimization by another youth, or that require added structural and staffing requirements to meet medical or mobility needs.

- Section 1.10.13.1: Bidder did not address individual therapy plans, in initial response.
- Section 1.10.22.1: In initial response, Bidder did not check the agree box; however, Bidder outlined in the narrative box how they would implement discharge planning into treatment.
- Section 1.10.23.7: In initial response:
 Bidder did not agree to this requirement. Bidder indicated "Should the youth's stabilization require a prolonged (more than 5 day) stay at a psychiatric hospital, HCS may not hold the bed and may choose to accept another youth into the program, which may limit availability. If a bed is available, but if HCS believes that the youth's return to the program may cause the youth harm due to specific risks within the milieu or other risks, HCS may decline to accept the child back into care."
- Section 1.10.25.2: In initial responses, Bidder did not agree to continue services for the youth up to 30 calendar days, giving indication they may pursue emergency replacement.
- Section 2.1.1: Bidder did not agree to this requirement, in initial response.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4. Staffing
Score: 19 / 20

- Section 4.6.4 : Bidder did not provide the individual's name in initial response.
- Section 4.7: Bidder's Organizational chart did not have staff members names, just titles. In clarifications, Bidder stated "As this will be a new program for HCS, these positions will be newly hired and/or individuals will be internally promoted. Names cannot be provided at this time."

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 5. Project Management, Section 8. Invoice and Payment, and Section 9. Service-Level Agreements

Score: 13 / 20

- Section 8.1.3.2: Bidder did not agree to this requirement 8.1.3.2 due to indicating they have exceptions to SLA1 and 2, in initial response.
- Section 9.3: Bidder did not agree to SLA 1, in initial response.
- Section 9.4: Bidder did not agree to SLA 2, in initial response.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 2.13, Section 5 Prior Experience
Score: 18 / 20

- Section 2.13: In initial response: Bidder did not address whether they believe the business of this Contract will impact revenue by more than 25%
- Section 5.1.2: In initial response: Bidder did not provide a description of their current licensing compliance and only stated "yes".
- Section 5.1.2.1: Bidder did not provide detail of their current environment and its safety status, in initial response.
- Section 5.2, Reference 1: In initial response, Bidder did not provide contact information email address, city, state, or zip code and did not indicate how long the reference had known/worked with the Bidder.

- Section 5.3, Reference 2: In initial response, Bidder did not provide contact information email address, city, state, or zip code and did not indicate how long the reference had known/worked with the Bidder
- Section 5.4, Reference 3: In initial response, Bidder did not provide contact information email address, city, state, or zip code and did not indicate how long the reference had known/worked with the Bidder

C. Life Skills Group (TYPE 1 Proposal)

The Evaluation Team determined that Life Skills Group, based on a total score of 76 did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, EXCLUDING Sections 4. Staffing, 5. Project Management, 8. Invoice and Payment, and 9 Service Level Agreements
 Score: 31 / 40**

- Section 1.1.1.1: JEC has concern with realistic timeframes that may impede with the expectations/requirements of the Contract, with Bidder having no building yet, only an approximate location and no license.
- Section 1.1.2.1: Bidder did not provide a plan for how the safety requirements will be achieved.
- Section 1.1.3.9: Bidder response was not sufficiently described in their response box; more information was found in Bidder's policy attachment, however, it still lacked addressing sexual orientation and religion.
- Section 1.2.3: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated that their exception was youth requiring mechanical restraints, which is not actually an exception under the Contract. No points deducted.
- Section 1.2.4: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated that Youth must be medically stable and not require ongoing skilled nursing care or cannot require mechanical restraints; This could be an exception under the Contract. No points deducted.
- Section 1.2.5: Bidder included contradictory statements in response by indicating taking only birth sex males/no restriction on SOGI and is not in compliance with license. No points deducted.
- Section 1.5.1: Bidder's plan lacked sufficient detail for on-going admission.
- Section 1.6.2: Bidder response was vague and minimal length of stay was not discussed beyond indicating smart goals.
- Section 1.9.2.1: Bidder indicate that they will only consider other region beyond the Southeastern Region on a case-by-case basis.
- Section 1.10.1.1: Bidder did not provide sufficient detail on how the trauma-informed model is embedded in all aspects of service delivery to the youth and families served.
- Section 1.10.1.4: Bidder did not address a screening tool for families.
- Section 1.10.1.5: Bidder's provided methods did not address families.
- Section 1.10.5.8.1: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and indicated that youth must be within the demographic limits noted on the Schedule G.
- Section 1.10.10.1: Bidder did not provide a sufficiently detailed plan and only briefly addressed it.
- Section 1.10.14.2.3: Bidder's reference to seasons was unclear. No points deducted.
- Section 1.10.20.2.2.2 and 1.10.20.2.2.3: Bidder indicated that they have not yet identified a consulting children's psychiatrist service.

- Section 1.10.27.3: Bidder did not provide a sufficient plan by only indicating that they will subcontract.
- Section 1.10.27.4: Bidder did not provide a sufficient plan by only indicating that the plan will be included in the contract of the subcontracted services.
- Section 1.10.27.5: Bidder did not provide a sufficient plan; plan was very brief.
- Section 1.10.27.6.1: Bidder did not provide a sufficient plan; plan was very brief.
- Section 1.10.27.6.3: Bidder did not provide a sufficient plan; plan was very brief.
- Section 1.10.27.7.1: Bidder did not provide a sufficient plan; plan was very brief.
- Section 1.12.1: Bidder did not provide a sufficient plan for continuous improvement; plan was very vague.
- Section 1.12.4: Bidder did not sufficiently describe their internal data collection methods; description was very brief.
- Section 2.4: Bidder did not address the detail box here/left it blank which states that they “must describe any State system access requirements that are necessary for the Bidder to perform its obligations on a timely basis, including but not limited to, physical or remote access to State networks, servers, or individual workstations.”

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4. Staffing

Score: 19 / 20

- Section 4.7: Organizational Chart did not have staff members names, just titles; chart was very high level and not broke out to individuals. Chart did not distinguish who is subcontracted and who is not.
- Section 4.9: Bidder did not identified subcontractors beyond indicating the 4 types they intend to subcontract.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 5. Project Management, Section 8. Invoice and Payment, and Section 9. Service-Level Agreements

Score: 16 / 20

- Section 5.5: Implementation planning lacked sufficient detail to satisfy that these plans are achievable.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 2.13, Section 5 Prior Experience

Score: 10 / 20

- Section 2.13: Bidder did not directly address this response as it applies to their company; instead, Bidder provided sister company revenue, recognizing that the Bidder does not have revenue to provide assurance previous successful operations, which indicates risk, and actually will increase gross revenue by more than 25%.
- Section 5.1 and 5.1.1 Prior Experience: Bidder indicated 30 years of experience, but it is not relevant in scope as it pertains to the population served (adults instead of youth).
- Sections , 5.3 and 5.4: Two of the three provided references provided do not align with the ability to evaluate service provision with the youth and families and there is concern with the references being paid service providers of the Bidder.

D. Vista Maria (TYPE 3 Proposal)

The Evaluation Team determined that Vista Maria based on a total score of 94 met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

Note: Bidder referenced human trafficking in Schedule G and several sections of the RFP and for the Juvenile Justice scope of work which is not applicable and not the population serviced under the scope of work in this RFP, therefore Bidder retracted that portion of their submission in clarification.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, EXCLUDING Sections 4. Staffing, 5. Project Management, 8. Invoice and Payment, and 9 Service Level Agreements
Score: 37 / 40

- Section 1.1.1.5: In initial response, Bidder did not agree to the requirement and struck out “On no day during this Contract period, must there be more than 15 youth in placement for whom MDHHS contracted for payment.”
- Section 1.1.3.2: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and indicates limiting areas. Bidder adjusted language to “include persons with residential foster care program lived experience (e.g., young adult, family members) on their Executive Board, or committees, or in programmatic decision making where appropriate.” In clarifications, “or” was determined to be mutually agreeable to include persons with lived experience on either the Executive Board, committees or involved in programmatic decision making where appropriate.
- Section 1.1.3.9: In initial response, Bidder did not agree to the requirement.
- Section 1.1.4: Bidder did not agree to the requirement, struck language, and indicated “maintain the capability to provide services 24 hours a day, 365 days a year as specified in the treatment plan for each youth accepted for care. Families can identify support needed, duration and by whom.” This takes away active ways for family support. This was resolved with mutually agreeable language in clarifications.
- Section 1.1.5: In initial response, Bidder did not agree to the requirement, struck language, and indicated “Per our Tracked Changes above, the individuals listed above will be provided, with prior notice, access to Vista Maria’s property to meet privately with youth.”
- Section 1.2.4: Bidder indicated exception, however the exception given, is actually in compliance with the contract as stated and intent. No points deducted.
- Section 1.4.1: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and indicated they “cannot admit the youth within five calendar days, unless another youth has been admitted within the last 20 days, the Contractor must notify RPU and the youth may be assigned to another placement based on the needs of the youth and the timeliness of the next vacancy.” In clarifications, Bidder still did not agree, but lowered increment from 20 to 14 days.
- Section 1.4.2: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and indicated: Per our Tracked Changes above, “The Probable Admit Date must be within five calendar days of acceptance, unless another youth has been admitted within the last 20 days.” In clarification and recognizing that this Statement of Work is not applicable to human trafficking, Bidder retracted their response to the Juvenile Justice Statement of Work/population.
- Section 1.4.6: Bidder did not agree to the requirement. Bidder changed language from 1 to 3 days and stated, “is not able to determine the potential safety of the youth, other youth or staff based on the information available in the MiSACWIS/CCWIS, Vista Maria must contact the RPU within three working days and request more information.”
- Section 1.4.7: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and changed the timeframe from 1 to 3 working days: if Vista Maria “is not able to determine the potential safety of the youth, other youth or staff based on the information available in the

- MiSACWIS/CCWIS, Vista Maria must contact the JJAU within three working days and request more information.” In clarification and recognizing that this Statement of Work is not applicable to human trafficking, Bidder retracted their response to the Juvenile Justice Statement of Work/population.
- Section 1.4.8: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and changed timeframes from 1 to 2 and added language on secure video conferencing indicating “want to interview the youth for an assessment to assist in making a safety decision prior to deciding to accept the youth for placement, Vista Maria must contact the case worker and/or RPU within two working days to interview the youth and/or family. The interview by Vista Maria will occur at the current placement of the youth or other location agreed upon with the case worker, or secure video conferencing.”
 - Section 1.4.9: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and changed the timeframe of this requirement from 1 to 2 working days: Bidder will “contact the JJS within two working days to interview the youth and/or family.” In clarification and recognizing that this Statement of Work is not applicable to human trafficking, Bidder retracted their response to the Juvenile Justice Statement of Work/population.
 - Section 1.5.1: In initial response, Bidder indicated “we will not accept admissions from MDDHS outside of normal business hours or on Mondays, Fridays, or during the weekend” which is a limitation on the flexibility of admissions.
 - Section 1.10: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and adjusted language: “at a minimum, youth will receive bi-weekly individual therapy and bi-monthly family therapy as appropriate and defined in the treatment plan.”
 - Section 1.10.1.1: In initial response, Bidder did not agree to the requirement and inserted “as defined by the contractor”.
 - Section 1.10.1.2: In initial response, Bidder did not check the agree box/left box blank however response box detail indicated that they agree.
 - Section 1.10.2.2: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and inserted additional language: “for youth with no identified permanent family and connection, the primary focus will be on permanency, and Vista Maria and State will develop a comprehensive permanency plan for the youth within 30 days of placement. The parties understand that failure to do so may result in lengths of stay beyond 180 days.” In clarifications, revised language was mutually agreed to.
 - Section 1.10.2.4.1: In initial response, Bidder did not agree and changed time from 120 days to 365 Vista Maria will “complete the Building Bridges Initiatives Six Core Strategies leadership and direct care modules within 365 days of the signed Contract effective date.”
 - Section 1.10.5.2: Bidder did not agree to the requirement and struck out “or primary caseworker/agency” and indicated “Youth will not be moved from one residential placement or program to another, even within the same campus/area until the RPU has completed the re-placement process.”
 - Section 1.10.5.7.3: In initial response, Bidder did not agree to the requirement and indicated “In event of an emergency placement, the DHS-3600 must be fully executed at the time of placement.”
 - Section 1.10.6.2: In initial response, Bidder did not agree to the requirement and struck out seclusion and seclusion/isolation.
 - Section 1.10.6.3: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and struck out seclusion and seclusion/isolation. In clarification and recognizing that this Statement of Work is not applicable to human trafficking, Bidder retracted their response to the Juvenile Justice Statement of Work/population.

- Section 1.10.7.1: In initial response, Bidder did not agree to this requirement and struck out seclusion and seclusion/isolation.
- Section 1.10.8.4: In initial response, Bidder did not agree to the requirement, changed “work with” to “partner with” and indicated they will “partner with the youth, family, treatment team, primary caseworker/agency and local Community Mental Health (CMH) provider to assist the youth in developing meaningful connections to the youth’s family, community, and other non-family resources.”
- Section 1.10.10.2: In initial response, Bidder did not check the agreement box.
- Section 1.10.10.3: In initial response, Bidder did not check the agreement box. . In clarification and recognizing that this Statement of Work is not applicable to human trafficking, Bidder retracted their response to the Juvenile Justice Statement of Work/population.
- Section 1.10.16.3: In initial response, Bidder did not agree to this requirement and added language indicating that their “efforts are to support the prior efforts from the MDHHS primary caseworker before the youth’s admission to obtain the necessary educational documentation.”
- Section 1.10.16.10: In initial response, Bidder did not check the agreement box, although process detailed below appeared to comply.
- Section 1.10.20.2.2.18: In initial response, Bidder did not check the agreement box, although process detailed below appeared to comply.
- Section 1.10.25: In initial response Bidder did not agree to the requirement and changed timeframe of 30 days to 60 days. Bidder indicated “An unplanned discharge will be defined as occurring when Vista Maria requests removal of the youth from placement, within 60 days, prior to the youth successfully achieving the treatment goals.”
- Section 1.10.25.1: In initial response, Bidder did not agree to the requirement. Bidder changed 30 to 60 days: “is requesting the unplanned discharge of a youth in their program due to one of the outlined reasons, a request for discharge within 60 days must be submitted in writing to the primary foster care caseworker and RPU.”
- Section 2.1: Bidder did not agree to this requirement, in initial response.
- Section 2.4: Bidder did not agree to this requirement and left the agree box blank, in initial response.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4. Staffing
Score: 19 / 20

- Section 4.7: Bidder did not include subcontractor on their organizational chart, in initial response.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 5. Project Management, Section 8. Invoice and Payment, and Section 9. Service-Level Agreements
Score: 19 / 20

- Section 5.6.4: In initial response, Bidder did not agree to the requirement; Bidder agreed to an Annual Financial Review only, and agreed to Quarterly and Annual Service Level and Performance Reviews.in clarify.
- Section 5.7.9: In initial response, Bidder did not agree to the requirement and indicated: “Vista Maria requests to see the drafted Quarterly and Annual report templates prior to the Contract Effective Date. The Financial Review will occur annually only, no earlier than December 15.”

-Section 8.1.3.2: In initial response, Bidder did not agree and stated, “What is the process for remitting quarterly SLA credits/penalties?”

**4. Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 2.13, Section 5 Prior Experience
 Score: 19 / 20**

-Section 2.13: In initial response, Bidder did not address this Section: If receiving a contract under this RFP will increase your gross revenue by more than 25% from last year’s sales, explain how the company will scale-up to manage this increase.

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

Selection Criteria	Great Lakes Recovery Centers, Inc. (TYPE 1 Proposal)	Holy Cross Services, Inc. (TYPE 1 Proposal)	Life Skills Group (TYPE 1 Proposal)	Vista Maria (TYPE 3 Proposal)
1 Schedule A, Statement of Work, EXCLUDING Sections 4. Staffing, 5. Project Management, 8. Invoice and Payment, and 9 Service Level Agreements 40 Points	22	32	28	37
2 Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 5. Project Management, Section 8. Invoice and Payment, and Section 9. Service-Level Agreements 20 Points	16	19	19	19
3 Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 5. Project Management, Section 8. Invoice and Payment, and Section 9. Service-Level Agreements 20 Points	19	13	19	19
4 Vendor Questions Worksheet Section 2.13, Section 5 Prior Experience 20 Points	20	18	10	19
Total	77	82	76	94

V. Pricing Summary

Pricing was evaluated for the Bidders who passed technical. The following is a summary of their price proposals:

	Holy Cross Services Final*	Vista Maria Final*
Number of Children Served	11	17
Per Diem Rate	\$ 2,570.41	\$ 1,295.00
1-Year Estimate (3)	\$ 11,258,395.80	\$ 8,035,475
3 Year Estimate (3)	\$ 33,775,187.40	\$ 24,106,425
Miscellaneous Costs	\$ 3,955,511.00	\$ -
Total Costs	\$ 37,730,698.40	\$ 24,106,425

*Estimated totals assume 100% of Bidder's capacity, 365 days per year.

VI. Negotiations

Clarifications and reductions were requested and negotiated with the two Bidders who passed the technical evaluation. Bidders final pricing is reflected in the table above; noting that clarification was needed on Holy Cross's initial pricing proposal to obtain an accurate initial cost due to the miscellaneous costs provided and broken formulas. In negotiation, Vista Maria was unable to lower their pricing, but was able to increase the bed capacity from 8 to 17. Holy Cross was able to reduce their per-diem pricing by \$572.85 (an estimated \$2,299,992.75 lower, per year) and lowered capacity by 1, once the miscellaneous (one-time start-up costs) were separated out from the on-going costs that tabulated into the per-diem rate. Holy Cross was able to reduce their one-time start-up costs of \$5,295,511.00 by \$1,340,000.00 once allowable costs were negotiated. However, even with the reductions, the JEC determined Holy Cross's rates were significantly more than the industry standard for the per diem rate and extremely high miscellaneous/one-time start-up costs.

VII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offers the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions* Evaluation Process section, and price.

Vista Maria provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation included having reasonable pricing, offering a safe surveilled environment, accommodating youth with high needs and providing specialized services, and providing services within the timeframes required to reduce length of stay.

As part of the best value determination, overall economic impact to the State of Michigan was considered and is not a determinative factor in making this award.

Award Recommendation is made to Vista Maria in the amount of \$24,106,425.